

**REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES**

By this Amendment, Applicant: amends claims 1, 10, 17, 19 and 21-22; cancels claims 2, 6, 18, 20 and 24-25; and add new claims 26-31. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-5, 7-17, 19, 21-23 and 26-31 are pending in the application.

Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the following Remarks.

**35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-4, 7-8 and 11-17, 19 and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Neubauer et al. U.S. Patent 7,110,591 ("Neubauer"), and claims 5 and 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Neubauer in view of Burns, Jr. U.S. Patent 6,744,497 ("Burns").

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are patentable over the cited art for at least the following reasons.

**Claim 1**

Among other things, the camera of claim 1 includes an access controller configured to retrieve from an image sensor only the image data associated with selected pixels identified by a map stored in memory that identifies one or more pre-defined region of interest segments within a field of view of the camera.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither the teachings of Neubauer, nor Burns, nor any combination thereof would produce such a camera.

The Office Action cited col. 4, lines 63-65 of Neubauer as supposedly disclosing an access controller.

Applicant respectfully submits that nothing in col. 4, lines 63-65 of Neubauer discloses or remotely suggests that any access controller is configured **to retrieve from an image sensor only the image data** associated with selected pixels identified by a map stored in memory. Indeed, nothing in the cited text makes any mention or suggestion of an image sensor, or retrieving any image data from an image sensor.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that

claim 1 is patentable over the cited art.

Claims 3-4, 7-8 and 11-16

Claims 3-4, 7-8 and 11-16 all depend from claim 1 and are deemed patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, and for at least the following additional reasons.

Claim 8

Among other things, in the camera of claim 8 an access controller is further configured to calculate a reset time for each of the rows based on the map to provide a substantially uniform row exposure period throughout the pixel array.

In the rejection of claim 8 spanning pages 6 and 7 of the Office Action, no mention is made of this feature at all. Furthermore, the only text cited in the rejection of claims 7-8 clearly makes no mention of this feature.

**Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner either cite something in Neubauer and/or Burns that discloses the features of claim 8, or withdraw the rejection of Applicant's claim.**

Claim 17

Among other things, the optical inspection system of claim 17 includes an access controller configured **to retrieve from an image sensor only the image data** associated with the two or more region of interest segments defined by a map stored in a memory.

As explained above with respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, alone or taken collectively, do not teach an optical inspection system including such an access controller.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 is patentable over the cited art.

Claim 19

Among other things, the method of claim 19 includes outputting from an image sensor only the image data corresponding to the selected pixels identified by a map that identifies selected ones of the pixels located in one or more region of interest segments within an image.

For similar reasons to those set forth above with respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, alone or taken collectively, do not teach any method where an image sensor outputs from an image sensor only the image data corresponding to the selected pixels identified by a map that identifies selected ones of the pixels located in one or more region of interest segments within an image.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 19 is patentable over the cited art.

Claims 21-23

Claims 21-23 all depend from claim 19 and are deemed patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 19, and for at least the following additional reasons.

Claim 23

Among other things, the method of claim 23 includes calculating a reset time for each row of the plurality of pixels based on the map.

The Office Action states that Neubauer discloses such a feature at col. 6, lines 40-67.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant sees no mention in the cited text of any reset times for rows of pixels, or of calculating any reset times for any rows of pixels.

Indeed, Applicant respectfully submits that it is very apparent that the col. 6, lines 40-67 of Neubauer do not teach the features of claim 23.

Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 23 is patentable over the cited art.

**NEW CLAIMS 25-31**

New claims 25-31 all depend variously from claims 1, 17 and 19, and are deemed patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1, 17 and 19, and also because of the various novel features recited therein.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing explanations, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and reexamine the present application, allow claims 1, 3-5, 7-17, 19, 21-23 and 26-31 and pass the application to issue. In the event that there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Kenneth D. Springer (Reg. No. 39,843) at (571) 283.0720 to discuss these matters.

Respectfully submitted,

VOLENTINE & WHITT

Date: 22 April 2008

By: 

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kenneth D. Springer  
Registration No. 39,843

VOLENTINE & WHITT  
One Freedom Square  
11951 Freedom Drive, Suite 1260  
Reston, Virginia 20190  
Telephone No.: (571) 283.0724  
Facsimile No.: (571) 283.0740